



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,665	04/24/2001	Wang Ling	US010217	6225

24737 7590 07/30/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

BROWN, VERNAL U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2635	3

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/841,665	LING, WANG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vernal U Brown	2635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2001.
 - 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 - 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
- Disposition of Claims**
- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 - 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 - 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
 - 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 - 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

The application of Wang Ling filed April 24, 2001 has been examined. Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Griesau et al. U.S Patent 6507306.

Regarding claim 1, Griesau et al. teaches a method of controlling plural devices with a single remote control (figure 1) comprising the steps of associating, one by one, each of the plural devices with the remote control, and associating, one by one, each of the plural devices associated with the remote control with a particular function or key on the remote control (col. 3 lines 38-48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang et al. U.S patent 5962992.

Regarding claim 5, Huang et al. teaches an apparatus for controlling plural lighting devices over a wireless connection (figure 1), the apparatus comprising a processor (210) for providing commands to said plurality of lighting devices in normal mode (col. 6 lines 35-45), and a means for switching between an enumeration mode (installation and configuration mode) and a normal mode in which the enumeration mode being utilized to associate said plural devices with the apparatus (col. 9 lines 5-15).

Regarding claim 6, Huang et al. teaches the enumeration mode (installation mode) is complete by providing a visual confirmation with the LED (col. 10 lines 19-22).

Regarding claim 7, Huang et al. teaches comprising software for binding specific functions or key sequences from a remote control with specific ones of said plural lighting devices (col. 21 lines 10-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesau et al. U.S Patent 6507306 over Huang et al. U.S patent 5962992.

Regarding claim 2, Griesau et al. teaches a method of controlling plural devices with a single remote control (figure 1) but is silent on teaching the device communicates with the remote control by means of a carrier sense multiple access protocol. Huang et al. in an art related invention in the same field of endeavor of remote control teaches the control of a plurality of devices with a single remote control (figure 1) and the device communicate with the carrier sense multiple access protocol (col. 33 lines 37-40) in order to detect collision of the transmitted signals.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art for the devices to communicate with the remote control by means of a carrier sense multiple access protocol in Griesau et al. as evidenced by Huang et al. because Griesau et al. suggests controlling plural devices with a single remote control and Huang et al. teaches controlling plural devices with a single remote control by using the carrier sense multiple access protocol in order to detect collision of the transmitted signals.

Regarding claim 3, Griesau et al. teaches the step of associating one by one each of the plural devices associated with a particular function key utilized includes a visual confirmation shown in step 102 of figure 3.

Regarding claim 4, Griesau et al. teaches a visual confirmation of the association of the device to the function key (102 of figure 3) but is silent on teaching the visual confirmation includes a predefined sequence of on/off occurrences. Huang et al. in an art related invention in

Art Unit: 2635

the same field of endeavor of remote control teaches the visual confirmation includes a predefined sequence of on/off occurrences by flashing a LED (col. 8 line 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have visual confirmation that includes a predefined sequence of on/off occurrences in Griesau et al. as evidenced by Huang et al. because Griesau et al. suggests a visual confirmation of the association of the device to the function key and Huang et al. teaches the visual confirmation includes a predefined sequence of on/off occurrences by flashing a LED.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. U.S patent 5962992 in view of Mitchell et al. U.S Patent 5847955.

Regarding claim 8, Huang et al. teaches a method of utilizing a wireless lighting control protocol comprising the steps of providing a standardized command set for facilitating command and control between a master and plural slave lighting devices which is stored in the EEPROM (col. 6 lines 42-48). Huang et al. further teaches the binding of the slave devices and the master controller is achieved through the processor (col. 13 lines 29-40) which inherently includes the a software application but is not explicit in teaching interposing a layer of software between the command set and a software application and the layer of software includes means for initialization and binding of the plural slave lighting devices and the master device. Mitchell et al. in an art related remote control system teaches interposing a layer of software between a command set and a software application and the layer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to interpose a layer of software between the command set and a software application in Huang et al. as evidenced by Mitchell et al. because Huang et al. suggests teaches the binding of the slave devices and the master controller is achieved through the processor which inherently includes the a software application and Mitchell et al. teaches between a command set and a software application and the layer as a means of customization of the software application.

Regarding claim 9, Huang et al. teaches polling each of the slave devices individually and sequentially to thereby associate each of said devices with the master (col. 10 lines 50-59).

Regarding claim 10, Huang et al. teaches associating each of plural slave devices with a master remote control (100) comprising the steps of communicating a visual signal indicating the presence indicated by the installation of the unit and accepting a user confirmation acknowledging that the device is to be associated with a particular master device (col. 27 lines 45-64).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. U.S patent 5962992 in view of Mitchell et al. U.S Patent 5847955 and further in view of Grouev et al. 6333605.

Regarding claim 11, Huang et al. teaches the a lighting control system in which the master and the slave devices are in communication (figure 1) but is silent on teaching the master and the slave device communicates using the DALI protocol. One skilled in the art recognizes that DALI is used as a communication protocol as evidenced by Grouev et al. (col. 2 lines 24-27), therefore it is obvious to use DALI as the communication protocol in the lighting system of Huang et al. in view of Mitchell et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the master and the slave device to communicate using the DALI protocol in Huang et al. in view of Mitchell et al. as evidenced by Grouev et al. because Huang et al. in view of Mitchell et al. suggests a lighting control system in which the master and the slave devices are in communication and one skilled in the art recognizes that DALI is used as a communication protocol as evidenced by Grouev et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vernal U Brown whose telephone number is 703-305-3864. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 8:30 AM-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 703-305-4704. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.



Vernal Brown
July 23, 2003

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

